



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*mn*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,128	04/15/2004	Peter A. Franaszek	YOR920040079US1	3127
23413	7590	04/12/2007		
CANTOR COLBURN, LLP 55 GRIFFIN ROAD SOUTH BLOOMFIELD, CT 06002			EXAMINER BATAILLE, PIERRE MICHE	
			ART UNIT 2186	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS			04/12/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/709,128	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FRANASZEK ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Pierre-Michel Bataille	<b>Art Unit</b> 2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The present Office Action is taken in response to applicant's communication filed 22 March 2007 responding to Final Rejection dated January 24, 2007. Applicant's amendment and/or arguments have been considered with the results that follow.
2. Claim 1-29 are pending in the application under prosecution.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 03 November 2006, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-29 under 35 USC 102 in view of the reference by Keltcher et al. (US 6,314,494) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of the combination of US 6,314,494 (Keltcher et al) and US 6,973,547 (Nilsson et al).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,134,494 (Keltcher et al) in view of US 6,973,547 (Nilsson et al).

With respect to claim 1, Keltcher discloses the invention as claimed, a system for memory management, the system comprising: a tag controlled buffer in communication with a memory device, said memory device including a plurality of pages divided into a plurality of individually addressable lines, wherein said tag controlled buffer includes: (Fig. 3; Column 1, lines 29-42; Col. 4, Lines 17-27); a prefetch buffer including at least one of the individually addressable lines from the memory device (Fig. 1; Col. 3, Lines 11-32); and a tag cache in communication with the prefetch buffer, the tag cache including at least one tag, wherein each said tag is associated with one of the pages in the memory device, each said tag includes a pointer to at least one of the lines in the prefetch buffer and access to the lines in the prefetch buffer is controlled by the tag cache (Col. 6, Lines 4-25). Keltcher fails to specifically teach the tag including reference history field including information about how the lines from the associated page have been accessed in the past and is utilized to determine which lines in the associated page should be added to the prefetch buffer when the tag is added to the tag cache. However, Nilsson teaches History cache 302 being a cache memory including a plurality of entries each configured to store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block; the history field of each entry having a relatively deep history depth, the history field of each entry being configured to store indications of a history of memory access requests associated with the corresponding cache line (Fig. 3; Col. 5, Lines 28-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and having both teachings before him/her at the time of the invention, to have included a plurality of entries each configured to

store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block, as taught by Nilsson to the buffer pre-fetching system taught by Keltcher, because the combination would provide relatively large history depths detecting more complex memory access signatures, thus increasing prediction accuracy, as taught by Nilsson [Col. 5, Lines 53-55].

With respect to claim 14, Keltcher discloses the invention as claimed, a system for memory management, the system comprising: a random access memory including at least one line, wherein each line is associated with a page in a memory device and space in the random access memory is allocated on per line basis; a first cache device including a plurality of tags, wherein each tag corresponds to one of the pages in the memory device and each tag indicates the location in the random access memory of the at least one line associated with the page (Fig. 1 & 3; Col. 1, Lines 29-42; Col. 4, Lines 17-27; Col. 3, Lines 11-32); and a tag cache in communication with the prefetch buffer, the tag cache including at least one tag, wherein each said tag is associated with one of the pages in the memory device, each said tag includes a pointer to at least one of the lines in the prefetch buffer and access to the lines in the prefetch buffer is controlled by the tag cache (Col. 6, Lines 4-25). Keltcher fails to specifically teach the tag including reference history field including information about how the lines from the associated page have been accessed in the past and is utilized to determine which lines in the associated page should be added to the prefetch buffer when the tag is added to the tag cache. However, Nilsson teaches History cache 302 being a cache memory including a

Art Unit: 2186

plurality of entries each configured to store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block; the history field of each entry having a relatively deep history depth, the history field of each entry being configured to store indications of a history of memory access requests associated with the corresponding cache line (Fig. 3; Col. 5, Lines 28-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art and having both teachings before him/her at the time of the invention, to have included a plurality of entries each configured to store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block, as taught by Nilsson to the buffer pre-fetching system taught by Keltcher, because the combination would provide relatively large history depths detecting more complex memory access signatures, thus increasing prediction accuracy, as taught by Nilsson [Col. 5, Lines 53-55].

With respect to claims 2-20, 12-13, and 15-23, Keltcher teaches retrieving the line corresponding to the fault line identifier from a memory device (data retrieved from the main memory by the controller for execution to be cached in data cache); retrieving the line corresponding to the fault identifier from the prefetch buffer via a cache line; all of the lines in the prefetch buffer corresponding to one of the tags in the tag cache are deleted in response to the tag being deleted from the tag cache; the system implementing a replacement algorithm for the tags in the tag cache and for the lines in the prefetch buffer, wherein upon insertion of a new tag into the tag cache, a sufficient

Art Unit: 2186

number of the tags are removed to make space for the new tag and for the prefetch lines associated with the new tag [Col. 4, Lines 17-27; Col. 3, Lines 11-32].

6. Claims 11, and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,134,494 (Keltcher et al) in view of US 6,973,547 (Nilsson et al), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of US 5,544,342 (Dean).

With respect to claim 11, Keltcher teaches a system for memory management, the system comprising: a tag controlled (Fig. 3; Column 1, lines 29-42; Col. 4, Lines 17-27); a prefetch buffer including at least one of the individually addressable lines from the memory device (Fig. 1; Col. 3, Lines 11-32); and a tag cache including at least one tag, wherein each said tag is associated with one of the pages in the memory device (Col. 6, Lines 4-25 Nilsson teaches History cache 302 being a cache memory including a plurality of entries each configured to store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block; the history field of each entry having a relatively deep history depth, the history field of each entry being configured to store indications of a history of memory access requests associated with the corresponding cache line (Fig. 3; Col. 5, Lines 28-52). But, neither Nilsson nor Keltcher teaches specific reference to fault notification to access a second cache device. However, Dean teaches receiving fault notification including a fault page identifier and a fault line identifier, a fetch to the next level in the memory hierarchy in response to a cache miss [Col. 31, Lines 57-62]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having all three teachings before him/her at the time of

the invention to combine the Size Configurable Data Buffer for Data Cache and Prefetch Cache Memory, as taught by Keltcher and reference history data being used to determine which cacheable sub-units of the page should be pre-fetched to the cache, as taught by Nilsson and Dean's system and Method For Prefetching Information in a Processing System, because to utilize faults would have made the system more efficient and diminished error handling problems.

With respect to claim 24, 25, and 29, Keltcher teaches a system for memory management, the system comprising: a tag controlled (Fig. 3; Column 1, lines 29-42; Col. 4, Lines 17-27); a prefetch buffer including at least one of the individually addressable lines from the memory device (Fig. 1; Col. 3, Lines 11-32); and a tag cache including at least one tag, wherein each said tag is associated with one of the pages in the memory device (Col. 6, Lines 4-25); Nilsson teaches History cache 302 being a cache memory including a plurality of entries each configured to store within a history field a history of memory access messages associated with a corresponding data block; the history field of each entry having a relatively deep history depth, the history field of each entry being configured to store indications of a history of memory access requests associated with the corresponding cache line (Fig. 3; Col. 5, Lines 28-52). But, neither Nilsson nor Keltcher teaches specific reference to fault notification to access a second cache device. However, Dean teaches receiving fault notification including a fault page identifier and a fault line identifier, a fetch to the next level in the memory hierarchy in response to a cache miss [Col. 31, Lines 57-62]. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having all three teachings before him/her at the time of



Art Unit: 2186

the invention to combine the Size Configurable Data Buffer for Data Cache and Prefetch Cache Memory, as taught by Keltcher and reference history data being used to determine which cacheable sub-units of the page should be pre-fetched to the cache, as taught by Nilsson and Dean's system and Method For Prefetching Information in a Processing System, because to utilize faults would have made the system more efficient and diminished error handling problems.

With respect to claims 26-28, Dean teaches retrieving the line corresponding to the fault line identifier from a memory device (data retrieved from the main memory by the controller for execution to be cached in data cache); retrieving the line corresponding to the fault identifier from the prefetch buffer via a cache line [Col. 31, Lines 57-62].


### ***Conclusion***

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre-Michel Bataille whose telephone number is (571) 272-4178. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon, Tue-Fri (8:00A to 5:30P).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew M. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2186

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Pierre-Michel Bataille  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2186